



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/693,930

10/28/2003

Akio Omiya

Q78145

4147

23373 7590 11/05/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

HERNANDEZ, NELSON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/693,930

Applicant(s)

OMIYA ET AL.

Examiner

Nelson D. Hernandez

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12, 14-25, 29 and 31-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 11, 13, 26-28, 30 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges the mended claims filed on August 16, 2007.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13 and 26 have been amended. **Claim 34** has been newly added.

Claims 12, 14-25, 29, and 31-33 have been withdrawn as they belong to a Non-Elected Species.

Specification

2. The Examiner acknowledges the amendments made to the title filed on August 16, 2007. The new title is acceptable.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 16, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicants argues the following:

- a. "However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Nomura does not teach the claimed third lens. Specifically, the claimed third lens is saved to a third lens saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, at a time of a collapse of the lens barrel. At no point is the third lens group L3 of Nomura saved to a position out of the optical axis.

The Examiner appears to concede this point and cites Wakabayashi to cure the deficiency. Assuming arguendo Wakabayashi teaches the claimed

third lens, it would not be obvious to modify Nomura as suggested by the Examiner.

Nomura discloses that the "third lens frame 22 is driven to move forward and rearward along the optical axis Z1 by a mechanism including the linear guide holes 22b of the two radial arms 22a, the cylindrical portion 22c and the aforementioned feed screw shaft when the feed screw shaft rotates forward and reverse." Therefore, it would be contrary to the principle of operation of the lens group L3 of Nomura to move the lens group out of position of the optical axis. In addition, although Nomura discloses that more than one of the lens groups can be positioned outside the optical axis, Nomura discloses that the other lens group would be the first lens group and not the third lens group. See Nomura para. [0073].

In addition, Nomura discloses that "although the second lens group L2 is the optical element among the optical elements of the photographing optical system which is removed from a position on the optical axis thereof in the above illustrated embodiment of the retractable zoom lens, one or more of any other optical element such as the diaphragm shutter S and the low-pass filter F can constitute the removable optical element(s) in the same manner as the second lens group L2 of the above illustrated embodiment of the retractable lens system." See Nomura para. [0076]. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the third lens group L3 is moved out of position of an optical axis."

➤ The Examiner acknowledges that Nomura et al. does not explicitly disclose that the third lens group L3 is moved out of position of an optical axis. However, the Examiner understands that although moving the third lens group out of position of an optical axis is not explicitly stated by Nomura, Nomura teaches that multiple arrangements can be performed without departing from the scope of the invention as discussed in page 6, ¶ 0071-0076. Nomura et al. discusses several of the multiple arrangements that can be performed with respect to figs. 11-13, where the first and second lens groups are moved out of position of an optical axis and also discusses that other elements in the optical path can be arranged to be moved out of the optical axis (page 6, ¶ 0071-0076). Furthermore, Nomura et al. discusses that the not only other optical elements can be arranged to be moved out of the optical axis but also discusses that different numbers of optical elements can be arranged to be moved out of the optical axis as an alternative. Nomura et al. teaches that the principle of the invention is to remove optical elements from the optical axis at the time the lens barrel is retracted to make the camera more compact (Page 1, ¶ 004-0022; page 6, ¶ 0071-0076).

As discussed in the previous Office Action, since Nomura et al. discloses that different arrangements can be made without departing from the scope of the invention that would result in different camera systems where different optical elements are removed from the optical path at the time of retracting the lens barrel to minimize the size of the camera, the Examiner presented the teaching of Wakabayashi et al., which discusses the concept of removing a focus lens

from the optical path by disclosing a camera comprising a lens barrel (figs. 3 and 4) in which a focus lens 80 and a wide-angle lens 70 are removed for the optical axis of the main lens 60 depending on the operation of the camera in order to perform proper focus adjustment of the image being captured (Col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31). The Examiner understands that although Wakabayashi et al. does not explicitly teach that the focus lens is removed for the optical axis in order to retract or extend the lens barrel, after analyzing the teaching of Nomura et al. and the possibility of arrange the optical system of the camera in different ways without departing from the scope of Nomura et al. invention and also after analyzing the concept of removing the focus lens form the optical path as discussed in Wakabayashi et al. one of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious to modify the teaching of Nomura et al. with the teaching of the concept discussed in Wakabayashi et al. to arrange the optical system in Nomura et al. to have the third lens (focus lens) saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the third lens group is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens with the motivation of performing proper focus adjustment of the image being captured and to have the lens barrel retracting as much as possible in order to reduce the camera size making it more portable.

b. "In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to move the third lens group L3 of Nomura out of the optical axis as claimed. Further, the Examiner's reasoning merely appears to be based on impermissible hindsight upon viewing the Applicant's disclosure."

➤ In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

4. Therefore, the rejections made to **claims 1-3, 11, 13, 26-28 and 30** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. in the previous Office Action are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-3, 11, 13, 26-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomura et al., US 2003/0156832 A1 in view of Wakabayashi et al., US Patent 4,937,609.**

Regarding claim 1, Nomura et al. discloses a digital camera (Fig. 1) that creates an image signal through catching a subject light, the digital camera comprising: an image taking lens (See fig. 1), which is variable in a focal length, comprising three groups of a first lens (Fig. 1: L1), a second lens (Fig. 1: L2), and a third lens (Fig. 1: L3) in the named order with respect to an optical axis direction; a lens barrel (Fig. 1: 12) that incorporates therein the image taking lens, having in front an aperture through which the image taking lens appears and having in rear an internal space defined by a wall (Fig. 1: 11), the lens barrel being free in extension and collapse and performing a focal length control; and a solid state imaging device (Fig. 1: C) that receives the subject light formed by the image taking lens to create the image signal, the solid state imaging device being supported by the wall (See fig. 1), wherein the lens barrel has: a second lens (zoom lens L2) advancing and saving mechanism in which at the time of the collapse of the lens barrel, the second lens is saved to a second lens saving position out of an optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the

lens barrel, the second lens is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens (See fig. 2) (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054); and a first lens (taking lens L1) advancing and saving mechanism in which at the time of the collapse of the lens barrel, the first lens is saved to a first lens saving position out of the optical axis, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the first lens is advanced onto the optical (See fig. 2) (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054).

Although Nomura et al. does not explicitly disclose that the third lens (focus lens) is the lens saved to a lens saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the third lens is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens, Nomura et al. discloses that the fundamental principle of the invention is that an element of a plurality of optical elements is removed from a position on the optical axis of the plurality of optical elements to a different position outside of the optical axis, and the removed element and at least one element of the remaining optical element(s) of the plurality of optical elements are moved rearward along the optical axis, for the purpose of refracting the plurality of optical elements from a ready-to-photograph state which initially lie on a single optical axis and that the structure of the retractable lens system according to the invention is not limited solely to that of the illustrated embodiments taught as long as the structure is designed on this fundamental principle. Nomura et al. also discloses that more than one of the lenses can be positioned outside the optical axis to retract the lens barrel even more (Page 6, ¶ 0073-0077).

Wakabayashi et al. teaches a camera (See fig. 4) comprising a lens barrel (See figs. 3 and 4) in which a focus lens (Fig. 3: 80) and a wide-angle lens (Fig. 3: 70) are

removed for the optical axis of the main lens (Fig. 4: 60) depending on the operation of the camera in order to perform proper focus adjustment of the image being captured (Col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31).

Although Wakabayashi et al. does not explicitly teach that the focus lens is removed for the optical axis in order to retract or extend the lens barrel. One of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious to combine the teaching of rearranging any of the optical element to retract even more the lens barrel in Nomura et al. in view of the teaching of removing the focusing lens out of the optical path depending on a camera operation as taught in Wakabayashi et al. to modify the camera in Nomura et al to have the third lens saved to third a lens saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the third lens is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens. The motivation to do so would have been to perform proper focus adjustment of the image being captured and to have the lens barrel retracting as much as possible in order to reduce the camera size making it more portable.

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches a focusing mechanism (Fig. 1: L3) wherein a focusing is performed by a movement of the third lens in the optical axis direction (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 3, the combined teaching of Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the lens barrel has: a second lens (rear lens) group guide frame (Nomura et al., fig. 1: 19; page 4, ¶

0060 – page 5, ¶ 0066) that moves in the optical axis direction in accordance with the extension, the collapse and the focal length control so as to determine a position related to the optical axis direction of the second lens; and a second lens (rear lens) group holding frame (Nomura et al., fig. 1: 21) that holds the second lens and is pivotally supported by the second lens guide frame, the second lens holding frame causing the second lens to revolve on the optical axis of the image taking lens at the time of the extension, and the second lens holding frame causing the second lens to revolve on the second lens saving position at the time of the collapse (Nomura et al., page 4, ¶ 0060 – page 5, ¶ 0066), and wherein the lens barrel has: a third lens (focus lens) group guide frame (Wakabayashi et al., figs. 3: 83 and 3: 82) that moves in the optical axis direction in accordance with the extension, the collapse and the focusing so as to determine a position related to the optical axis direction of the third lens (focus lens) group; and a third lens holding frame (Wakabayashi et al., fig. 3, 81) that holds the third lens and is pivotally supported by the third lens guide frame, the third lens holding frame causing the third lens to revolve on the optical axis of the image taking lens at the time of the extension, and the third lens holding frame causing the third lens to revolve onto the third lens saving position at the time of the collapse (Wakabayashi et al., col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 11, the combined teaching of Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the solid state imaging device being disposed at a position projecting from the wall to the internal space and being supported by the wall (See Nomura et al., fig. 1), and the second lens

Art Unit: 2622

holding frame (Nomura et al., fig. 1: 21) and the third lens holding frame (Wakabayashi et al., fig. 3, 81) cause the second lens and the third lens to revolve onto the second lens saving position set up to a hollow portion divided by the solid state imaging device and the wall beside the solid state imaging device and the third lens saving position, respectively, at the time of the collapse (Nomura et al., page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054; Wakabayashi et al., col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 13, the second lens holding frame (Nomura et al., fig. 1: 21) and the third lens holding frame (Wakabayashi et al., fig. 3, 81) have their centers of rotatable movement with respect to the second lens guide frame (Nomura et al., fig. 1: 19; page 4, ¶ 0060 – page 5, ¶ 0066) and the third lens guide frame (Wakabayashi et al., figs. 3: 83 and 3: 82) at mutually opposite positions with respect to the optical axis (by modifying the Nomura et al. reference interchanging the front lens L1 with the focus lens as taught in Wakabayashi et al., would result in having the second lens holding frame and the third lens holding frame have their centers of rotatable movement with respect to the second lens guide frame and the third lens guide frame at mutually opposite positions with respect to the optical axis as shown in fig. 1 in Nomura et al.) (Wakabayashi et al., col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 26, Nomura et al. discloses a digital camera (Fig. 1) that creates an image signal through catching a subject light, the digital camera comprising: an image taking lens (Fig. 1: 10), which is variable in a focal length, comprising three groups of a front elements lens (Fig. 1: L1), a rear elements lens (Fig. 1: L2), and a

focus lens (Fig. 1: L1) in the named order with respect to an optical axis direction, wherein a focusing is performed by a movement of the focus lens (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054); a lens barrel (Fig. 1: 12) that incorporates therein the image taking lens (Fig. 1: 10), having in front an aperture through which the image taking lens appears and having in rear an internal space defined by a wall (Fig. 1: 11), the lens barrel being free in extension and collapse and performing a focal length control (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054); and a solid state imaging device (Fig. 1: C) that receives the subject light formed by the image taking lens to create the image signal, the solid state imaging device being supported by the wall (See fig. 1), wherein the lens barrel has: a rear elements lens advancing and saving mechanism (See fig. 1) in which at the time of the collapse of the lens barrel, the rear elements lens is saved to a rear elements lens saving position out of an optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the rear elements lens is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054; page 4, ¶ 0060 – page 5, ¶ 0066); and a front element lens advancing and saving mechanism in which at the time of the collapse of the lens barrel, the front element lens is saved to a focus lens saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the front element lens is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens (Page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054; page 4, ¶ 0060 – page 5, ¶ 0066).

Although Nomura et al. does not explicitly disclose that the focus lens is the lens saved to a focus lens saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the focus lens is advanced onto the

optical axis of the image taking lens, Nomura et al. discloses that the fundamental principle of the invention is that an element of a plurality of optical elements is removed from a position on the optical axis of the plurality of optical elements to a different position outside of the optical axis, and the removed element and at least one element of the remaining optical element(s) of the plurality of optical elements are moved rearward along the optical axis, for the purpose of refracting the plurality of optical elements from a ready-to-photograph state which initially lie on a single optical axis and that the structure of the retractable lens system according to the invention is not limited solely to that of the illustrated embodiments taught as long as the structure is designed on this fundamental principle. Nomura et al. also discloses that more than one of the lenses can be positioned outside the optical axis to retract the lens barrel even more (Page 6, ¶ 0073-0077).

Wakabayashi et al. teaches a camera (See fig. 4) comprising a lens barrel (See figs. 3 and 4) in which a focus lens (Fig. 3: 80) and a wide-angle lens (Fig. 3: 70) are removed for the optical axis of the main lens (Fig. 4: 60) depending on the operation of the camera in order to perform proper focus adjustment of the image being captured (Col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31).

Although Wakabayashi et al. does not explicitly teach that the focus lens is removed for the optical axis in order to retract or extend the lens barrel. One of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious to combine the teaching of rearranging any of the optical element to retract even more the lens barrel in Nomura et al. in view of the teaching of removing the focusing lens out of the optical path depending on a camera operation as taught in Wakabayashi et al. to modify the camera in Nomura et al to have

the focus lens saved to a focus lens saving position out of the optical axis of the image taking lens, and at the time of the extension of the lens barrel, the focus lens is advanced onto the optical axis of the image taking lens. The motivation to do so would have been to perform proper focus adjustment of the image being captured and to have the lens barrel retracting as much as possible in order to reduce the camera size making it more portable.

Regarding claim 27, limitations can be found in claim 3.

Regarding claim 28, the combined teaching of Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 26 teaches that the solid state imaging device being disposed at a position projecting from the wall to the internal space and being supported by the wall (See Nomura et al., fig. 1), and the rear elements holding frame (Nomura et al., fig. 1: 21) and the focus lens holding frame (Wakabayashi et al., fig. 3, 81) cause the rear elements lens and the focus lens to revolve onto the rear elements lens saving position set up to a hollow portion divided by the solid state imaging device and the wall beside the solid state imaging device and the focus lens saving position, respectively, at the time of the collapse (Nomura et al., page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054; Wakabayashi et al., col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31). Grounds for rejecting claim 26 apply here.

Regarding claim 30, the combined teaching of Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 26 teaches that the rear elements holding frame and the focus lens holding frame cause the rear elements lens and the focus lens to revolve onto the rear elements lens saving position and the focus lens saving position set up to positions beside the front elements lens, respectively, at

the time of the collapse, wherein there is defined a plane vertical to the optical axis, which crosses, at the time of the collapse, the front elements lens, the rear elements lens and the focus lens (by modifying the Nomura et al reference interchanging the front lens L1 with the focus lens as taught in Wakabayashi et al., would result in having the rear elements holding frame and the focus lens holding frame cause the rear elements lens and the focus lens to revolve onto the rear elements lens saving position and the focus lens saving position set up to positions beside the front elements lens, respectively, at the time of the collapse, wherein there is defined a plane vertical to the optical axis, which crosses, at the time of the collapse, the front elements lens, the rear elements lens and the focus lens (in Nomura et al., fig. 11, the lenses when collapsed would result in a plane vertical to the optical axis, which crosses, at the time of the collapse, the front elements lens, the rear elements lens and the focus lens)) Nomura et al., page 2, ¶ 0051; page 3, ¶ 0052-0054; Wakabayashi et al., col. 3, lines 23-54; col. 5, line 47 – col. 6, line 49; col. 2, lines 16-31). Grounds for rejecting claim 26 apply here.

Regarding claim 34, the combined teaching of Nomura et al. in view of Wakabayashi et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the first lens (Nomura et al., fig. 1: L1), the second lens (Nomura et al., fig. 1: L2), and the third lens (Nomura et al., fig. 1: L3) are positioned in a predetermined sequential order with respect to the solid state imaging device and wherein the first lens is farthest from the solid state imaging device (As shown in fig. 1, Nomura et al. teaches that the first lens (L1) is the farthest from the solid state imaging device). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. **Claims 4-10** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 4, the main reason for indication of allowable subject matter is because the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest, including all the elements of the present claim, that the wall has a revolving affecting section having a geometry projecting into the internal space, the revolving affecting section being in contact with the second lens holding frame at the time of the collapse to affect revolving of the second lens holding frame, and the second lens holding frame has an affect receiving section that is pushed by the revolving affecting section at the time of the collapse so that the second lens revolves into the second lens saving position including all the limitations of claims 1 and 3.

Regarding claim 7, the main reason for indication of allowable subject matter is because the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest, including all the elements of the present claim, that the wall has a revolving affecting section having a geometry projecting into the internal space, the revolving affecting section being in contact with the third lens holding frame at the time of the collapse to affect revolving of the third lens holding frame, and the third lens holding frame has an affect receiving section that is pushed by the revolving affecting section at the time of the collapse so that the third

Art Unit: 2622

lens revolves into the third lens saving position including all the limitations of claims 1 and 3.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
October 23, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lin Ye', with a stylized flourish at the end.

LIN YE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER